

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

PAUL HENREID,

Plaintiff,

V.

KODNER WATKINS LC, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:23CV249 HEA

OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER


This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Recuse, [Doc. No. 34]. Plaintiff, a lawyer, is proceeding *pro se*. Plaintiff claims the undersigned should recuse based on a perceived bias or prejudice the Court has against Plaintiff. In support of his Motion, Plaintiff has submitted his affidavit wherein he claims the Court is prejudiced because the undersigned and Defendants attended the same law school, whereas Plaintiff attended Washington University School of Law located in the St. Louis area. Plaintiff presents various arguments in support of his motion which are based on Plaintiff's interpretation and supposition of the Court's June 14, 2024 Opinion, Memorandum and Order granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. Plaintiff's Motion will be denied.

“Motions to recuse may be based on either of two federal statutes, see 28 U.S.C. §§ 144, 455, but under either statute the standard is the same: ‘recusal is

required if the judge bears a bias or prejudice that might call into question his or her impartiality,' *United States v. Gamboa*, 439 F.3d 796, 817 (8th Cir. 2006).” *Akins v. Knight*, 863 F.3d 1084, 1086 (8th Cir. 2017).

Plaintiff’s Motion fails to satisfy either statutory provision. Attendance at the same law school as a party’s attorney does not indicate any bias or prejudice in and of itself. Moreover, simply because Plaintiff disagrees with the Court’s findings and conclusions does not suffice to implicate bias or prejudice. Reasonable persons would by no means interpret the Court’s analysis as indicative of any prejudice or bias against Plaintiff. The motion is therefore denied.

Dated this 24th day of June, 2024.


HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE